



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

elo

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,702	08/21/2001	Martin Taplan	NY-SCHT 215-US	9638
24972	7590	03/08/2004	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP 666 FIFTH AVE NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198			PAIK, SANG YEOP	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3742	
			DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004	

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/935,702

Applicant(s)

TAPLAN, MARTIN

Examiner

Sang Y Paik

Art Unit

3742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 18-23 and 29-38 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 18-23 and 29-38 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 37 are objected to because of the following informalities: on page 3 of the amendment filed on 1/5/04, the last two claims were numbered as claim 37. The second of the claims 37 is renumbered as claim 38. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claims 37 and 38 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 15 and 29 include the recited subject matter of claims 37 and 38, respectively. The recited term "consisting of" does not further limit what has already been claimed in claims 15 and 29, i.e., glass and glass ceramic, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15, 16, 18-23 and 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colvin (GB 2 099 137) in view of Lorenz et al (US 4,960,978).

Colvin shows the plate structure claimed including an edge of the plate having a cross-sectional portion thicker than the thickness of the plate. However, Colvin does not show that the plate is made of glass or glass ceramic.

Art Unit: 3742

Lorenz et al shows a plate made of glass or glass ceramic or metal such as steel as the cooking plate for a kitchen appliance. Lorenz et al further shows that the plate is mounted on its edge to a supporting frame.

In view of Lorenz et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Colvin with the cooking plate made of glass or glass ceramic since Lorenz et al teaches that such material can be alternatively used as a cooking plate as a metal plate, and it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the cooking plate on its peripheral edge to a mounting frame for convenient assembly of the plate and the mounting frame.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/5/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Colvin teaches away from using ceramic material as the heating plate because they tend to become brittle and tend to crack on cooling. While this may have been true at the time of the Colvin's invention in the year of 1981. The ceramic technology has advanced since then. As Lorenz et al indicates, in the year of 1989 at the time Lorenz's invention, the ceramic material such as glass or ceramic glass has developed such that it could be alternatively used in place of metal for the hotplate for a cooking appliance. In light such development in the ceramic technology, it would have been obvious at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the benefits of the Colvin's invention and the benefits of Lorenz's invention to combine and modify to bring about the claimed invention. Thus, the applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3742

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Y Paik whose telephone number is 703-308-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) First Friday Off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Paik

Sang Y Paik
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3742

syp